

REMARKS

Examiner states that the Office Action dated March 23, 2000 "is responsive to the amendment filed 8/4/99". Applicants note that no amendment was filed on 8/4/99, but that an Amendment After Final was filed (but not entered) on December 20, 1999. Applicants filed a Continued Prosecution Application for this case on January 14, 2000, indicating that "the unentered amendment previously filed on December 20, 1999 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 in the prior nonprovisional application" should be entered. Applicants believe the current Office Action, dated March 23, 2000, is actually responsive to the Amendment dated December 20, 1999, and respond accordingly.

Claims 1, 7, 12 and 16 have been amended to clarify that the claims of the present invention are directed towards a file previewing apparatus and method that consists of displaying both "internal file characteristics and file image". As stated in the Specification as originally filed at page 2, line 20 "previewing with respect to a file includes an overview of or summary of file characteristics and contents including images". Support for these claim changes can be found in the Specification as originally filed at least at page 2, lines 16-22 and page 6, line 32 to page 7, line 4.

Examiner states that "Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps (Figs. 1-9, 1994)". Relying on Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 2, the Examiner states that the "Quick View pop-up window...enables users to open, and display the internal contents of a file, e.g., color-type, graphics, font etc, without opening an application program in the computer's memory)".

Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 2 does disclose a user interface for opening, and displaying the internal contents of a file, but not for displaying "internal file characteristics and file image". The "contents" of the file accessed and displayed by Quick View is the display image itself, not including internal file characteristics (see Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 4). Nowhere does Quick View display internal file characteristics, such as "height,

width, length, color type, resolution, compression type used for storing and forming the file, and annotation graphics of the file”.

Separately, Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 5 discloses a user interface for displaying file properties/characteristics, but these properties/characteristics are external, not internal file properties/characteristics (see Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 7). The characteristics disclosed in Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 7 include file: type, location, size, compressed size, MS-DOS name, created data, modified date, accessed date, read-only, archive, compressed, hidden and system attributes. All of these characteristics are external characteristics, available from the file system, without opening the desired file.

In contrast, the present invention as claimed in Claims 1, 7 and 12, does open the desired file, and displays internal file characteristics not available from the file system (e.g., height, width, length, color type, resolution, compression type used for storing and forming the file, and annotation graphics of the file). Applicants believe that the present invention's previewing of a desired file, including both internal file characteristics and file image/content, is not disclosed by the prior art of Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps (Figs. 1-9, 1994) and is therefore patentably distinguishable. Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps (Figs. 1-9, 1994) be withdrawn.

Examiner states that “Claims 6, 10-11, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps (Figs. 1-9, 1994) in view of Buitron (Pat. #5,799,307, 8/25/1998, filed 10/6/1995)”. Claim 6 is dependent on independent Claim 1, Claims 10-11 are dependent on independent Claim 7, and Claims 13 and 15 are dependent on independent Claim 12. Based upon the arguments above, independent Claims 1, 7 and 12 are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art. Therefore, Claims 6, 10-11, 13, and 15 are also believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art by virtue of the fact that, if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, for the above-stated reasons, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 6, 10-11, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims (Claims 1-17) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (781) 861-6240.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mary Lou Wakimura  
Mary Lou Wakimura  
Registration No. 31,804  
Telephone (781) 861-6240  
Facsimile (781) 861-9540

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421-4799

Dated: 6/5/00